

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/696,066	10/29/2003	David S. Benco	LUTZ 2 00212 5949		
48116 FAY SHARPE	7590 09/04/2007 //LUCENT		EXAMINER		
1100 SUPERIOR AVE SEVENTH FLOOR CLEVELAND, OH 44114			EKONG, EMEM		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	,		2617		
			<u></u>		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			09/04/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/696,066	BENCO ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
EMEM EKONG	2617		

	EMEM EKONG	2617	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appear	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 30 July 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL	ICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	ving replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o se with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mo	idavit, or other eviden compliance with 37 Cl	rce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expires 3_months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	on.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropri	ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	s of the date of e appeal. Since
	and mulay to the data of films a buist	will make his and annual to	
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, t They raise new issues that would require further cor They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below 	nsideration and/or search (see NO	, will <u>not</u> be entered be TE below);	ecause
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or 	ter form for appeal by materially re	ducing or simplifying	the issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		•	,
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 		timely filed amendme	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) I how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		II be entered and an e	explanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome all rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fai	ls to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ned.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowar	nce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).		
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Applicant's explanation of the claimed invention is well appreciated, however, after careful consideration, the Applicant's arguments are not persuasive. Pepper discloses Applicant's limitations, however, Pepper fails to disclose screening calls based on a current cost of message units. Hartmaier discloses monitoring subscriber's calls and determining the cost of the call and appropriately reducing the account balance (par. 9 lines 3-5, par. 25 lines 11-12, and par. 79-82). Hartmaier also discloses monitoring device 904 (see fig. 9), a call-monitoring module 110 (see fig. 1) that calculates the cost of a call and causes a warning signal to be initiated when the cost for the call approaches a threshold, the purpose of the call monitoring module containing a rating engine which determines access fee (either by month, week or day), the per minute charges for air time usage (pars. 79, and 82), is clearly for rating calls used for call screening (see abstract, and pars. 72, and 87). Hartmaier further discloses restricting calls to/from certain telephone numbers, certain calling zones, or certain geographical boundaries (par. 9 lines17-19, and pars. 87-88). Certainly, Hartmaier determines the cost of calls to/from certain telephone numbers, certain calling zones, or certain geographical boundaries, and based on cost, restriction is performed, therefore, Hartmaier discloses applicant's limitation of screening calls based on a current cost of message units.

With regards to the claims of which Wise was relied on, the Applicant's limitation stated, "processing the call request according to the current ration station", and not processing the call request according to a current cost of message units as stated in applicant's argument. The Examiner respectfully believes that based on the explanation given on page 8 of the Applicant's specification that Wise discloses Applicant's limitations. Wise further discloses screening incoming and outgoing calls (col. 1 lines 20-23, col. 2 line 23, and col. 3 lines 30-42), and the use of cellular phone for incoming and outgoing call screening is also well known in the art. Therefore the argued limitations as recited in claims are the same as disclosed by the reference or the limitations are written broad such that they read on the cited art.

LESTER G. KINCAID

SUPERVISORY PRIMARY EXAMINER